

their character. It is particularly to be regretted that the gifted architect of the Goldsmiths' Company had not the choice allowed him of rebuilding their hall in a style which, whilst it permitted the company to display the resources of their great wealth, would have been far more appropriate to the very confined situation in which the hall is placed than the colossal order now employed; and since as many of the features are in the present building, what a scope was presented to the architect for introducing every variety of Tudor detail, in a structure possessing an advantage so rarely to be met with in London—that of a distinct frontage on four sides! and, connected as the Sovereign is with the company, a great field was open for adorning both the exterior and interior with the embellishments derived from heraldry in sculpture and stained glass. Had the example been set by this rich body, it must have had a great influence on other similar corporations, which have in some instances rebuilt their almshouses in the old English manner. One could wish that another great public building—

“Even there, where merchants most do congregate”

a building associated with the recollections of the last sovereign of the Tudor dynasty, the princely foundation of a Graham—had been rebuilt in a style of national architecture. And here again the peculiarities of the old English method were admirably adapted to the locality, which is too confined, and the value of the surrounding property too great, to admit a sufficient area to be cleared for the due display of classic architecture, especially if, as in this instance, the order employed is large. In narrow thoroughfares, columns and pilasters take up much of valuable ground; whereas, in a Gothic building more effectual shelter would be obtained by arcades. No room would be wasted, since the arcades would carry the walls immediately above; and light, that most important point to be studied in a London situation, would be obtained in much greater abundance from the oriels and wide-spreading bay windows of a Tudor building, than from the comparatively narrow openings of the classic style, with half their quantity of light obscured by columns. In a “Royal Exchange,” also, the introduction of the effigies of our sovereigns (but not in Roman costume would be so very appropriate. And that expense which is now lavished in producing elaborate carvings, which awaken no responsive chord of sympathy in our bosoms, would have afforded a series of portraits of departed worthies to excite the emulations of future Walworths and Whittingtons; and, instead of (as in the “Old Change,” and perchance it may be in the New) introducing beings which never existed but in the poet’s fancy, we might have sculptures which should more particularly commemorate the greatness of England in her character of a maritime power. The sum of money allowed for the New Exchange would produce much more display in a Tudor than in a classic building. In the different inns of court various occasions have likewise arisen, from fire or other causes, of restorations and alterations being made in the old English manner; but although one would think that here there could be no hesitation about the matter, since most of these institutions have actually some building or other in that style, we see sometimes new buildings erected in the most bald and characterless style possible. A happy example on the contrary is, however, now in progress of being built by the society of Lincoln’s Inn; and in the adoption of this style on the occasion, we see precisely its fitness for the purpose, since in such societies (to name only one peculiarity) the distinctions still prevail which formerly gave rise to the dais, or raised place of honour; and the building in question, erected as it will be with good, honest materials of brick and stone, will be far more appropriate, picturesque, and economical than any tame or cramped imitation of the styles of Greece or Rome.

A town which should be built entirely, or nearly so, in the Gothic style, would be one of the most interesting places in the world, at the same time one of the most economically built and enduring. The churches should be the most prominent objects, their spires or lofty towers distinguishing them from buildings devoted to secular purposes; the town hall, with its ample arcades, affording shelter from rain, protection from heat, and convenient space for out-of-door meetings; the market place, with that beautiful feature, the market cross; the free and grammar schools, the almshouses of a substantial and plain character, and the various public and private buildings, might all be designed with an appropriate general effect, and each in a manner suited to its particular purpose,—laid out in broad streets, some of them perhaps wide enough for rows of trees; a beautiful supply of water issuing from ornamental conduits, and happily situated with the mighty ocean for its boundary and chief attraction. Such a town would be better

than all the whitewashed and flimsily-contrived structures which adorn (?) our newly-erected towns. If we go back to early times, we shall not find in one city a confused jumble of the styles of all nations. In Athens the Agora, or market-place, partook of the same Doric character with the more majestic Parthenon; and the exquisite little structure erected at the individual expense of a Chorus (Lysicrates), is yet as much an example of the Corinthian order as the vast temple in honour of the Father of the Gods (Temple of Jupiter Olympius). In ancient Rome, also, we find one national style of architecture pervading, as well as her theatres, her forum, her baths, her triumphal arches and honorary columns, as her temples and religious structures. And therefore should not something of the same kind exist in London? Why should we not return to a style which is our own, which has always proved attractive to the general observer as well as to the enlightened amateur, when a really good and spirited imitation has been produced, as, for instance, the great hall of Christ’s Hospital, London, by Mr. Shaw, or the Grammar School at Birmingham by Mr. Barry? It is probable that nearly all foreigners who visit England think more of Oxford as a school of architectural display than all the rest of England put together; and this feeling must arise from the fact of so many fine and beautiful specimens of our national style of building being collected together in one city, and where the works even of a Wren, a Gibbs, and a Vanbrugh, look sadly out of place amid the glories of a Wykeham, a Wrencliffe, and a Wolsey.

London, 28th June. PHILIP TUDOR.

NEW CHURCH.

CHELSEA COLLEGE.—The governors of Chelsea College have purchased, at 1,200*l.*, a piece of ground adjoining the college, for the erection of a church for the pensioners, which church will be also free to the public. A bill is before Parliament, authorizing the governors to apply a portion of the property bequeathed to the college by Colonel Drouly towards the erection of the proposed church.

OUR CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BUILDER.

SIR,—I have been struck with an account in *THE BUILDER*, No. 21, of an extract from a Norwich paper, in which Mr. Nelson is made to say, “I have risen by my own exertions from being a clerk in an office, to be the third man in the kingdom!” of course he means as an architect.

Now, Sir, I believe it is not usual for any professional man to arrogate to himself precedence; the public voice generally proclaims the parties who are entitled to the front rank. But without waiting to inquire who are the two gifted beings to whom Mr. Nelson is content to yield the pride of place, the public and the profession will be inclined to ask if the gentleman in question has distinguished himself more in Grecian architecture than a Smirke, a Burton, a Bouverie, an Inwood, a Verilliam, or a Wyatt; in Roman and Italian architecture, than a Cockerell, a Hardwick, a Tate, or a Cundy; in Gothic, than a Barry, a Blom, a Cottingham, a Terrey, a Hopper, a Lamb, a Pugin, a Salvin, a Savage, or a Shaw. These are a few names of some eminence, and those well known, picked out at random, and though classed, nearly all are familiar with one style as much as with another. But I believe that not one of this list would say of himself that he was first, or second, or even third.

London, July 3, 1843. AN ARCHITECT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BUILDER.

SIR,—In the article headed “Serious Discovery,” and which appears to have been copied from *The Bury and Norwich Post*, you, I believe, have made a mistake, it having reference to St. Mary’s Church, Bury, and not Norwich, as described in *THE BUILDER* of last week.

The architects to the Church at Wimbledon were Messrs. Scott and Moffatt, and the contractors Messrs. Goswell, Parsons, and Finch, of Wimbledon.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BUILDER.

SIR,—I think if a part in *THE BUILDER* was allowed for inquiries and answers on building subjects, it might be the means of exciting an interest, and, as a beginner, allow me to ask a few plain questions of the writer of the description of the Model Farm House, No. 20, page 247:—I am at a loss to know why the pantry should be made behind the kitchen fire-place, and where is the light and air admitted into the pantry? as I have always considered that a pantry should be well lighted and airy, but by this plan it appears from the apartment No. 5, to be just the reverse: and it also appears

very strange to me that the dairy should be connected with the brewhouse and wash-house, as shown by Nos. 7 and 8 on the plan, and I have always thought it the best for a dairy not to be connected with any other apartment, but here is quite the reverse, the entrance being from the brewhouse and wash-house, so that the steam and stew made in them will find its way into the dairy, and also the heat from the back of the boiler; the same as the pantry from the kitchen fire-place; perhaps your correspondent will give a reason why it should be so, that a pantry should neither have light nor air admitted into it, but only when the door is open, and also what advantage the dairy will derive from the steam and stews that are made in the brewhouse and wash-house. I am, yours,

A FARMER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BUILDER.

SIR,—Mr. Peck, of Cambridge, is building the “Cambridge Almshouses;” his estimate was either 20*l.* or 30*l.* under 6,000*l.* Mr. Webster’s tender was the next in amount, 6,200*l.*; the others I know not.

I suppose you are aware there is a Cemetery building here. Mr. Lamb is the architect, assisted, I believe, by Mr. Loudon, in laying out the ground. The committee for this said Cemetery advertised for and received tenders, but the materials are found, and the building going on under direction of the architect.

I have been looking rather anxiously in your valuable publication for some further articles on emigration. As my anxiety is shared by others, perhaps you will take it into consideration.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Cambridge, July 3, 1843. W. W.

LETTER II.

THE DWELLINGS OF THE POOR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BUILDER.

DEAR SIR,—In connection with my remarks on this interesting and important subject of social economy, which you did me the favour to insert in your journal of the 17th instant, I would further impose upon the attention of your readers some of the facts developed by the Poor Law Commissioners in their numerous inquiries into the sanitary condition of the population. I have selected the evidence chiefly from the populous districts of Manchester, Liverpool, and other large towns where the manners and conditions of the inhabitants assimilate most with those of the metropolis. My present remarks will be devoted more particularly to tenements let out as unfurnished apartments, and on a future occasion to the commoner lodging-houses. My object, as I stated in my last, is to draw the attention of the philanthropic to put into operation some plan which a knowledge of these circumstances may suggest, whether as a matter of private speculation or of benevolent co-operation.

Mr. Chadwick, in his report, presented by order of her Majesty to both Houses of Parliament in July, 1842, justly observes that “one of the circumstances most favourable to the improvement of the condition of an artisan, or an agricultural labourer, is his obtaining as a wife a female who has had a good industrial training in the well-regulated households of persons of higher condition.” He gives the following instance of the effect of the dwelling itself, however, on the condition of such a female servant when married:—“Her attendance to personal neatness,” says a lady, who is my informant, “was very great; her face seemed always as if it were but just washed, and with her bright hair neatly combed underneath her snow-white cap, a smooth white apron, and her gown and handkerchief carefully put on, she used to look very comely. After a year or two she married the serving man, who, as he was retained in his situation, was obliged to take a house as near his place as possible. The cottages in the neighbourhood were most wretched kind, mere hovels built of r—, and covered with ragged thatch; the few even of these, so that there was no choice, they were obliged to be content with the first that was vacant, which was in the most retired situation. After they had been married about two years, I happened to be walking past one of these miserable cottages, and as the door was open, I had the curiosity to enter. I found it was the house of the servant I have been describing. But what a change had come over her! Her face was dirty, and her tangled hair hung over her eyes; her cap, though of good materials, was ill washed and slovenly put on; her whole dress, though apparently good and serviceable, was very untidy, and looked dirty and squalid; every thing, indeed, about her seemed wretched and neglected (except her little child), and she appeared very discontented. She seemed aware of the change there must be in her appearance since I had last seen her, for she imme-